The Inglis–Teller Relation and the Stark Effect in Plasmas: From Hydrogen Line Merging to Density Diagnostics

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

January 15, 2026

Spectroscopy often treats the Stark effect as a controlled tool: apply a known electric field, observe orderly shifts and splittings, and infer molecular structure, dipole moments, or polarizabilities. Astrophysical and laboratory plasmas invert this logic. There, the "field" is not a knob but an emergent, random microfield generated by nearby ions and electrons. The result is not primarily a neat multiplet pattern, but a progressive broadening and dissolution of highly excited (Rydberg) atomic levels until adjacent transitions overlap and spectral lines merge into a quasi-continuum. The classic Inglis–Teller relation captures this threshold in a remarkably compact scaling law linking the highest resolvable principal quantum number in a hydrogenic series to the plasma particle density. In this paper we build a conceptual bridge between familiar Stark spectroscopy and the plasma microfield regime, showing how level spacing and Stark sensitivity compete as n increases, why the "last visible line" becomes a density ruler, and how assumptions (ion-only microfields, quasi-neutrality, line series choice) shape practical interpretation. The goal is to make the Inglis–Teller idea feel like a natural extension of Stark physics—while clarifying where plasma reality departs from the tidy laboratory ideal.

Keywords: Inglis–Teller relation, Stark effect, plasma spectroscopy, hydrogen line broadening, Rydberg states, microfield distribution, Holtsmark field, electron density diagnostics, spectral line merging, Balmer series, Paschen series, line dissolution, quasi-neutral plasma, Stark broadening theory, astrophysical plasmas.

A collaboration with GPT-5.2-Thinking. 48 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: One Name, Two Worlds of Stark Spectroscopy
1.1 Stark effect as a controlled probe in molecular spectroscopy
1.2 Stark effect as an emergent microfield phenomenon in plasmas
1.3 The central diagnostic question: what does “the last resolved line” measure?

2. The Stark Effect: A Unifying Framework
2.1 Perturbation viewpoint: energy shifts from external electric fields
2.2 Linear vs quadratic Stark regimes: what determines the order
2.3 Degeneracy and symmetry: why hydrogenic Rydberg manifolds are special
2.4 Selection rules and what spectroscopy actually “sees”

3. Hydrogenic Level Structure and the High-n Compression
3.1 Principal quantum number scaling and why adjacent levels crowd
3.2 Line series (Lyman/Balmer/Paschen): observational consequences
3.3 Rydberg states as amplifiers of electric-field sensitivity
3.4 The intuition: shrinking spacing meets growing Stark response

4. Plasmas as Stochastic Field Environments
4.1 The microfield concept: many charges, no single “E”
4.2 Ion microfields vs electron impacts: slow vs fast perturbers
4.3 Typical assumptions: quasi-neutrality and singly charged ions
4.4 Microfield distributions (Holtsmark picture) at a conceptual level

5. From Stark Splitting to Line Broadening and Line Dissolution
5.1 Why randomness turns splitting into broadening
5.2 The meaning of “overlap”: when components become indistinguishable
5.3 The physical threshold: mixing within n-manifolds and between n-levels
5.4 Quasi-continuum formation and the disappearance of discrete lines

6. Deriving the Inglis–Teller Scaling Without Getting Lost
6.1 The balancing idea: Stark scale equals adjacent-level spacing scale
6.2 Where the steep n-power comes from (n-sensitivity vs n-spacing)
6.3 The canonical form: $N \cdot n^{(15/2)} = \text{constant} \cdot a0^{(-3)}$
6.4 What the constant encodes: microfield model and approximation choices

7. Practical Use as a Density Diagnostic
7.1 Step-by-step: identifying the last resolvable line in a series
7.2 Converting n_max into density (and what density, exactly)
7.3 Ion density vs electron density: when $N_e \approx N_i$ is justified
7.4 Units, quick estimates, and sanity checks

8. Connecting Back to Molecular Stark Spectroscopy
8.1 Controlled uniform fields vs stochastic plasma microfields
8.2 Clean multiplets vs broadened envelopes: why resolution differs
8.3 Linear/quadratic parallels: orientation, polarizability, and degeneracy
8.4 What “strong field” means in each context

9. Limitations, Failure Modes, and Interpretation Traps
9.1 Electron-impact broadening and when “ions only” breaks down
9.2 Non-hydrogenic emitters, ionic species, and departures from hydrogenic scaling
9.3 Optical depth, instrument resolution, and blending not caused by Stark physics
9.4 Temperature, plasma inhomogeneity, and time variability
9.5 The danger of over-reading a single n_max measurement

10. Worked Examples and Thought Experiments
10.1 A Balmer-series example: estimating density from n_max
10.2 Comparing two plasmas with different n_max: why the scaling is so steep
10.3 What changes if the series is Paschen instead of Balmer
10.4 A “molecular Stark” analog: what an equivalent random field would do

11. Broader Context: Where Inglis–Teller Shows Up
11.1 Astrophysical applications: stellar atmospheres and nebular plasmas
11.2 Laboratory plasmas: discharges, arcs, and fusion-edge diagnostics
11.3 Rydberg physics as a bridge between AMO and plasma spectroscopy
11.4 Why simple scaling laws persist in messy environments

12. Conclusion: The Same Stark Effect, Reversed Logic
12.1 The conceptual takeaway: from applied-field metrology to density inference
12.2 What the Inglis–Teller relation gives you—and what it cannot
12.3 A disciplined workflow for using “line merging” as a diagnostic

13. References

Art

1. Introduction: One Name, Two Worlds of Stark Spectroscopy

The Stark effect names a single physical idea—atomic or molecular energy levels respond to electric fields—yet it lives in two very different experimental cultures. In one culture, the electric field is a carefully engineered instrument: uniform, known, stable, and deliberately swept so that spectral lines move in orderly ways that can be modeled and inverted to obtain molecular structure. In the other culture, the electric field is not an instrument but an environment: a restless, stochastic microfield produced by a crowd of charged particles in a plasma. There, the same underlying interaction rarely yields clean, resolvable multiplets. Instead, it produces broadened, blended, sometimes "dissolved" spectral features whose very loss of order becomes the signal. The result is a conceptual inversion that is easy to miss if one learned Stark spectroscopy in the laboratory first: in plasmas, you often do not use a known field to measure a species; you use a species' response to unknown fields to measure the plasma.

This paper is built around that inversion. It treats the Inglis–Teller relation as a bridge: a compact scaling law that translates a qualitative observational threshold—where a line series stops being resolvable—into a quantitative statement about density. The goal is not merely to repeat the formula, but to make its logic feel inevitable once the two "worlds" of Stark physics are placed side by side: controlled-field metrology versus microfield-driven dissolution. The same name, the same interaction term, but a different experimental posture and a different kind of inference.

1.1 Stark effect as a controlled probe in molecular spectroscopy

In molecular spectroscopy, the Stark effect is often taught as a model example of turning a perturbation into a measurement device. One applies a strong but controlled electric field—ideally spatially uniform across the interaction region—and watches how rotational, vibrational, or electronic transitions shift and split. The field is not mysterious; it is characterized by electrode geometry, voltages, spacing, calibration routines, and stability checks. Because the field is known, the observed response becomes a direct fingerprint of molecular properties.

This is where "linear versus quadratic" Stark language feels most concrete. Many molecular states exhibit a predominantly quadratic response at modest fields, because the first-order shift is symmetry-forbidden unless the field mixes states of appropriate parity. But real molecules are rich with near-degeneracies: Λ-doubling, inversion doubling, hyperfine structure, and closely spaced rotational ladders can all supply the ingredients for strong first-order mixing. In practice, one learns that "linear" and "quadratic" are not just mathematical categories; they are diagnoses of what the field is doing to the state manifold: whether it is gently polarizing via second-order mixing, or actively re-diagonalizing a near-degenerate subspace so that effective orientation occurs.

The epistemic structure of the inference is similarly direct. You control the field, you measure the spectral displacement, and you fit a Hamiltonian model to extract parameters: dipole moments, polarizabilities, rotational constants, or state mixing coefficients. The spectra tend to retain crispness because the field is uniform and the experiment is built to preserve resolution: cold beams, narrow linewidth lasers or microwaves, high-Q resonators, and careful suppression of uncontrolled gradients. Even when the pattern becomes complicated, it is complicated in a "deterministic" way: a calculable multiplet structure rather than a stochastic smear. In this world, the Stark effect is a lens: it sharpens identity by forcing the molecule to reveal its internal structure.

1.2 Stark effect as an emergent microfield phenomenon in plasmas

In a plasma, the electric field is rarely an external knob and rarely uniform at the microscopic scale that matters for line formation. An emitter—an atom, ion, or Rydberg species—sits inside a charged many-body environment. Nearby ions and electrons generate an ever-changing local field whose magnitude and direction fluctuate across space and time. The emitter does not experience "the" plasma field; it experiences a distribution of microfields. The Stark effect still occurs, but now it is being driven by a field that is random in the same sense that thermal velocities are random: statistically describable, not precisely controllable.

This difference reshapes what the spectroscopy looks like. Rather than a discrete set of Stark components that you can label and track as a function of applied field, you see broadened lines whose shapes encode a convolution over many microfield values and dynamical histories. The broadening is not merely an inconvenience; it is often the diagnostic. Because the microfield strength correlates with density (and with charge state and screening), the Stark imprint becomes a density probe.

A second plasma-specific feature makes the Inglis–Teller story possible: hydrogenic Rydberg structure. Highly excited states in hydrogen (and hydrogen-like ions) are extraordinarily sensitive to electric fields, and they become more sensitive as the principal quantum number increases. Meanwhile, the spacing between adjacent principal levels collapses as n grows. Put those together in a fluctuating field environment and you get an inevitable outcome: at sufficiently high n, the Stark perturbation produced by typical microfields becomes comparable to (or larger than) the energy separation between neighboring n-levels. When that happens, the emitter's "level identity" is no longer robust. The spectrum stops presenting a neat sequence of discrete lines and begins to resemble a continuum. The field has not merely shifted lines; it has erased the separations that define the lines.

In this world, the Stark effect is less like a lens and more like a solvent: it dissolves fine spectral structure into broader features. And paradoxically, that dissolution can be measured with surprising power, because the threshold where it happens moves steeply with density. The

same physics that makes plasmas spectroscopically messy also makes them diagnostically legible.

1.3 The central diagnostic question: what does "the last resolved line" measure?

At the center of the Inglis–Teller method is a deceptively simple observational act: identify the highest member of a spectral series that still appears as a distinct, resolvable line—call it n_max—and note where the sequence becomes indistinguishable. What, exactly, does that threshold measure?

The operational answer is: it measures a competition between two scales. One scale is the intrinsic separation between adjacent principal quantum levels, which shrinks rapidly with n. The other scale is the typical Stark perturbation induced by plasma microfields, which grows strongly with n because Rydberg states are large, polarizable, and near-degenerate. When the microfield-driven splitting/broadening of the n-manifold becomes comparable to the spacing between n and n+1, the spectrum loses the ability to represent those levels as distinct transitions. "Resolved line" becomes "merged line," and soon becomes "pseudo-continuum."

But the deeper answer is that n_max is a proxy for density because the microfield statistics are density-set. In the simplest picture, the typical distance to the nearest ion shrinks as density rises; smaller distances mean stronger Coulomb fields; stronger fields mean larger Stark perturbations; larger perturbations push the dissolution threshold to lower n. Thus, high density makes the series terminate early; low density lets the series climb to higher n before it blurs out.

This is why the phrase "last resolved line" is simultaneously empirical and theoretical. Empirically, it depends on instrument resolution, signal-to-noise, blending with other species, opacity, and line-of-sight averaging. Theoretically, it corresponds to a microphysical criterion: the point where level mixing and Stark broadening undermine the very concept of discrete Rydberg levels. Inglis–Teller is powerful because it compresses that microphysical criterion into a single scaling relation that is steep in n. Yet its interpretation requires discipline: n_max is not a pure number handed down by nature; it is a number read off a real spectrum, shaped by plasma conditions and by measurement limitations.

So the guiding diagnostic question of this paper becomes: when you point to the final distinguishable line in a hydrogenic series, are you seeing a fundamental plasma threshold or an observational one—or, more realistically, what mixture of both? The work that follows will treat this as the core interpretive problem: turning a visually obvious spectral fact into a physically meaningful density inference, while being honest about the assumptions that make the translation valid.

2. The Stark Effect: A Unifying Framework

The Stark effect is best treated not as a specialized topic in either atomic or molecular spectroscopy, but as a single unifying mechanism: an electric field reshapes the energy landscape of bound states by coupling them to each other through the electric dipole interaction. From that standpoint, the "two worlds" discussed in the Introduction are simply two different ways of supplying the field (controlled versus stochastic) and two different observational consequences (resolvable patterns versus broadened dissolution). The underlying physics is the same interaction term, and the differences follow from symmetry, degeneracy structure, and the statistical character of the field. This section frames the Stark effect in a way that makes it portable: you can carry the same conceptual machinery into molecular beams, laboratory plasmas, and stellar atmospheres without changing the core principles—only the regime.

2.1 Perturbation viewpoint: energy shifts from external electric fields

At the most basic level, a bound state experiences an energy shift because an external electric field modifies the Hamiltonian. The interaction is dominated (at ordinary field strengths) by the electric dipole term, which can be expressed conceptually as "field times dipole." In a stationary quantum state, the relevant statement is that the field introduces couplings between the unperturbed eigenstates, and the true field-dressed eigenstates are found by re-diagonalizing the Hamiltonian in whatever subspace the field significantly mixes.

This viewpoint matters because it prevents a common misunderstanding: the Stark effect is not primarily about the field "pushing charges around" in a classical picture (though that intuition can be helpful), but about the field introducing *new mixing pathways* between quantum states. When the mixing is weak, the state remains mostly itself and the energy shift can be approximated by perturbation theory. When the mixing is strong—often the case for hydrogenic Rydberg manifolds or for certain molecular near-degeneracies—the field reorganizes the basis entirely, and the "shift" is better understood as a new set of eigenstates with different symmetries and level spacings.

In controlled spectroscopy, this is an advantage: you can sweep the field and watch the eigenstates evolve, effectively "turning on" couplings to extract hidden structure. In plasmas, the same mathematical fact becomes messy: the field is not single-valued but distributed, so the spectrum reflects an ensemble average over many field-dressed eigenstructures. The perturbation viewpoint still governs the result; it simply has to be applied statistically rather than deterministically.

2.2 Linear vs quadratic Stark regimes: what determines the order

The familiar distinction between linear and quadratic Stark effects is not arbitrary; it is a symmetry statement about whether a given state can have a first-order energy shift in an

electric field. In many systems, a non-degenerate stationary state has no permanent electric dipole moment in the absence of a field because of parity (or more generally, inversion symmetry). In that common situation, the first-order shift vanishes, and the leading effect is second-order: the field mixes the state with opposite-parity states, producing an induced dipole and an energy change proportional to the square of the field strength. This is what people often mean by a "quadratic Stark effect": it is the spectral expression of polarizability.

Linear Stark behavior emerges when the field can produce a first-order effect because the relevant subspace contains states that are already degenerate or nearly degenerate in a way that allows the field to choose a new basis with a nonzero dipole expectation value. In practice, this happens under several common conditions:

- **True degeneracy (or tight near-degeneracy):** If multiple states lie at nearly the same unperturbed energy, even a modest field can strongly mix them. The diagonalization then yields new eigenstates whose energies shift approximately in proportion to the field magnitude, because the field term dominates within that subspace.
- **Opposite-parity partners close by:** Many molecules have pairs of states with opposite parity separated by small splittings (e.g., doubling phenomena). An applied field readily mixes them, producing effectively oriented states and near-linear shifts over a field range.
- **Hydrogenic n-manifold structure:** In hydrogen (and hydrogen-like systems), the enormous degeneracy within a fixed principal quantum number n means there are many states with the same energy before fine structure and external fields are considered. The field can reorganize this manifold in a way that produces linear-like Stark splittings that grow rapidly with n.

This is why your earlier instinct—"isn't this the same Stark effect we use with molecules under strong fields?"—is correct, and also why the plasma case feels different. In molecular work, the linear/quadratic character often depends on whether you are mixing a small pair of near-degenerate partners or probing a more isolated level where the response is dominantly polarizability. In plasma hydrogen spectroscopy, the relevant high-n manifolds are so dense and so easily mixed that linear Stark structure and large broadening are difficult to avoid; what differs is whether you can resolve the resulting components or whether a fluctuating field turns them into a smear.

2.3 Degeneracy and symmetry: why hydrogenic Rydberg manifolds are special

Hydrogenic systems occupy a privileged place in Stark physics because their unperturbed energy levels depend primarily on n, not on the orbital angular momentum quantum number in the idealized Coulomb problem. That means that, for a fixed n, there exists a large family of distinct

states that are (in the simplest picture) exactly degenerate. Real atoms are never perfect hydrogen: fine structure, Lamb shifts, quantum defects, and core penetration effects break the degeneracy to varying degrees. But for sufficiently high-n states—especially in hydrogen itself—the manifold remains densely packed and unusually susceptible to electric-field mixing.

Two consequences follow that matter directly for Inglis–Teller:

1. **The field has "many options" to mix states.** Because there are many nearby states of appropriate symmetry within the same n (and between adjacent n values), the dipole coupling introduced by the field can be exceptionally effective. The system is not confined to weak second-order shifts; it can reorganize into new eigenstates that are strongly polarized along the field direction, producing large splittings.

2. **The sensitivity grows quickly with n.** Rydberg states are large in spatial extent. In a semiclassical sense, the electron's orbit (or wavefunction radius) scales upward with n, so the "lever arm" for an electric field to separate charge distribution increases. In a quantum sense, dipole matrix elements between nearby Rydberg states become large. Either way, high-n states behave like field amplifiers: a microfield that would barely perturb a low-n state can dramatically restructure a high-n manifold.

Symmetry is the other half of the story. The Stark interaction couples states in ways constrained by angular momentum and parity. Hydrogenic manifolds contain a rich mix of angular momentum states that provide many allowed couplings, and the degeneracy means these couplings often matter at low field strengths. The outcome is that hydrogenic Rydberg spectra are where the Stark effect becomes not merely a small correction but a dominant organizing principle for the observed line shapes.

In molecular spectroscopy, "degeneracy" is often engineered or exploited (choose a transition where the right doubling exists, use strong fields to polarize). In hydrogenic plasma spectroscopy, degeneracy is a natural feature of the system, and the plasma microfield supplies the mixing whether you asked for it or not.

2.4 Selection rules and what spectroscopy actually "sees"

A crucial practical point is that spectroscopy does not reveal "energy levels" directly; it reveals *transitions* between levels, and transitions are constrained by selection rules and by how the experiment samples the ensemble. This matters for Stark physics because the field changes not only the energies but also the character of the eigenstates—meaning the allowed transitions and their intensities can change as well.

In controlled-field experiments, you often resolve this explicitly: as the field increases, lines split, crossings appear, avoided crossings reshape intensities, and selection rules can look "relaxed" because the field-mixed states borrow character from one another. What you observe is

therefore a combined effect of (a) energy shifts and (b) intensity redistribution due to state mixing. Interpreting Stark spectra is as much about tracking eigenvectors as eigenvalues.

In the plasma microfield setting, the same ingredients are present, but the field is distributed. The observed line profile becomes an average over many emitters experiencing different microfield strengths and orientations. Even if each emitter had a well-defined set of Stark components at a given instantaneous field, the ensemble would present a broadened envelope. And because the microfield also changes in time, additional dynamical averaging occurs. The result is that "what spectroscopy sees" is not a set of neat components but a profile whose width and shape encode the microfield statistics and the emitter's field response.

This is the gateway to the Inglis–Teller concept. As n rises, the density of nearby states and the strength of Stark mixing increase, which both (i) spreads transition strengths across many components and (ii) pushes those components into overlap with adjacent n transitions. At some point, no selection rule bookkeeping can save the discrete line series: the profiles blend into each other. Thus, the last resolved line is not merely a place where transitions become forbidden; it is a place where the field-dressed transition network becomes so dense and smeared that the spectrum can no longer maintain discrete identity.

The remainder of the paper will build on this unified framework: the Stark effect as field-induced mixing subject to symmetry, degeneracy, and transition constraints, with the "two worlds" distinguished mainly by whether the field is deterministic (so you can map the structure) or stochastic (so you infer the environment from the smear).

3. Hydrogenic Level Structure and the High-n Compression

The Inglis–Teller idea lives in a very particular corner of spectroscopy: hydrogenic atoms (or nearly hydrogenic ions) at high principal quantum number. In that corner, nature supplies a built-in amplifier and a built-in bottleneck. The amplifier is that highly excited (Rydberg) states respond strongly to electric fields, whether those fields are applied by electrodes or arise stochastically as plasma microfields. The bottleneck is that the spectrum's natural "grid spacing"—the energy separation between adjacent n levels—collapses rapidly as n increases. When you combine an amplifier with a bottleneck, you get a threshold phenomenon: above some n, the levels cannot remain spectroscopically distinct under typical field perturbations. This section builds the core intuition: why hydrogenic levels crowd at high n, why different hydrogen line series matter observationally, and why Rydberg states are unusually vulnerable to microfields.

3.1 Principal quantum number scaling and why adjacent levels crowd

Hydrogenic energy levels have a famously simple dependence on n: the binding energy scales

approximately as $1/n^2$. That simplicity hides the important diagnostic feature: the *difference* between neighboring levels shrinks much faster than most people intuit the first time they see a Rydberg series.

If the energy goes like $1/n^2$, then the gap between n and n+1 scales roughly like the derivative with respect to n, which behaves like $1/n^3$ for large n. The practical meaning is that doubling n does far more than "add one more step" in a ladder; it compresses the ladder spacing dramatically. At low n, adjacent levels are widely separated; at high n, the ladder rungs crowd together so tightly that any perturbation—even a modest one—can blur the distinction between rungs.

There are two additional pieces of crowding that matter in practice:

- **Within a given n, there are many states.** Even before you talk about fine structure, a fixed n contains multiple angular momentum sublevels. In the ideal Coulomb problem these are degenerate, and in real hydrogen they are split only slightly. The manifold becomes increasingly dense in state count as n grows.
- **Between adjacent n, the manifolds overlap more easily under perturbation.** Because the n and n+1 energies approach each other as $1/n^3$, a perturbation that "reorganizes" the manifold at n also begins to couple it to the manifold at n+1. At high n, the difference between "within-manifold mixing" and "between-manifold mixing" becomes less and less sharp.

This is the origin of "high-n compression": it is not merely that the series lines get closer together in wavelength, but that the underlying level structure becomes so tightly packed that its identity can be lost under realistic environmental perturbations.

3.2 Line series (Lyman/Balmer/Paschen): observational consequences

Hydrogen line series are organized by the lower level of the transition: Lyman ends at n=1, Balmer ends at n=2, Paschen ends at n=3, and so on. At the level of the Inglis–Teller diagnostic, what matters is that you are watching transitions whose upper level climbs to high n while the lower level remains fixed. As n rises, these transitions accumulate toward a series limit.

Observationally, different series matter for several reasons:

- **Wavelength region and transparency.** Lyman lines lie in the ultraviolet and are frequently affected by absorption and instrumental constraints; Balmer lines are in the visible and are often the workhorse for both laboratory and astrophysical spectra; Paschen and higher series lie in the infrared and may be favored in dusty or reddened environments, or where IR instrumentation is superior.

- **Series crowding manifests differently in each band.** The crowding toward the series limit is a universal feature, but whether you can actually resolve high-n members depends on your spectrograph's resolving power in that wavelength region, the local continuum level, and competing blends from other species.
- **Lower-level population and optical depth differ.** In many plasmas, the population of the lower level and radiative transfer effects can make some series lines stronger or weaker, broader or more self-absorbed, even before Stark physics is invoked. That changes which "last resolvable line" you can reliably identify.
- **Diagnostic convenience.** In practice, people often choose the series that yields the clearest high-n termination in their setup—clear enough that the termination is genuinely caused by microfield/Stark dissolution rather than by a simple loss of signal.

The key point is that the Inglis–Teller method is not attached to a single series; it is attached to the general hydrogenic phenomenon of series convergence and high-n vulnerability. But the series you choose determines how cleanly you can observe the convergence and how confidently you can attribute the disappearance of distinct lines to plasma microfields rather than to observational limitations.

3.3 Rydberg states as amplifiers of electric-field sensitivity

Rydberg states are often described as "large atoms," and that phrase captures the essential diagnostic fact: their spatial extent and their susceptibility to external perturbations grow rapidly with n. They are easy to polarize, easy to mix, and easy to ionize compared with low-n states.

In Stark terms, high-n states behave like field amplifiers because:

- **Dipole couplings between nearby Rydberg states become large.** The electric field couples states through the dipole interaction, and the relevant matrix elements between neighboring high-n states grow strongly with n. This makes even modest fields capable of producing substantial level mixing.
- **Near-degeneracy makes first-order mixing easy.** Hydrogenic manifolds contain many states packed close in energy. In a dense manifold, the field does not need to "reach far" in energy space to find a partner state to mix with; it finds plenty of nearby candidates, so the effective response can become large and often approximately linear in the field within that subspace.
- **The environment supplies the field whether or not you want it.** In a plasma, the microfield is set by the proximity of ions and electrons. A Rydberg emitter effectively

samples those microfields with exaggerated sensitivity, making it a natural probe of the plasma's charge environment.

This is why the same Stark effect that is a precise metrological tool in controlled experiments becomes a blunt but powerful diagnostic tool in plasmas. High-n states turn local fields into big spectroscopic consequences.

3.4 The intuition: shrinking spacing meets growing Stark response

The Inglis–Teller "last resolved line" threshold is, at heart, a meeting point between two trends that run in opposite directions as n increases:

- **Trend A: adjacent-level spacing shrinks rapidly.** The spectral series compresses as you approach the series limit. Energetically, the n to n+1 separation falls roughly like $1/n^3$, so the system's capacity to keep transitions distinct decreases sharply with n.
- **Trend B: Stark response grows rapidly.** The Stark splitting/broadening associated with electric fields grows strongly with n because high-n states are easy to mix and polarize. In the plasma setting, the "field strength" to use is not a single value but a typical microfield magnitude, which increases with density. But for any given plasma, the high-n response increases so steeply that there will be an n where the Stark perturbation becomes comparable to the intrinsic spacing.

Once these two scales become comparable, a qualitative change occurs. You move from "a line that is broadened but identifiable" to "a line that is no longer a line," because its Stark-smeared components overlap both internally (within the n-manifold) and externally (with adjacent n transitions). At that point, the concept of a discrete upper level becomes unstable: the emitter's eigenstates are no longer closely aligned with a single unperturbed n, and the transition network becomes dense enough to fill in the spectral gaps. The spectrum stops being a ladder of resolved lines and becomes a band edging toward the continuum.

This is why the observed termination point is such a steep function of density. If density increases, typical microfields increase, the Stark scale increases, and the meeting point moves to lower n. If density decreases, microfields weaken, and the meeting point moves to higher n. The termination is not arbitrary; it is the visible footprint of where "level spacing" loses the race against "field response."

In the next section, this intuition is formalized: the plasma microfield is treated statistically, and the "meeting point" becomes a criterion that yields the Inglis–Teller scaling relation linking n_{max} to density.

4. Plasmas as Stochastic Field Environments

If the Stark effect in laboratory spectroscopy is "electric-field metrology," then plasma Stark spectroscopy is "electric-field ecology." The emitter is immersed in a charged environment whose field is not uniform, not constant, and not even well-defined at a single value. The electric field at the emitter's location is the vector sum of contributions from many nearby charges, each moving in time. That immediately forces a change in how we think: we stop talking about *the* field and start talking about a **microfield distribution**—a probability landscape of field magnitudes and directions that different emitters sample at different times. In this view, a spectral line shape becomes a statistical report about the plasma's local charge environment, filtered through the emitter's Stark sensitivity.

This section lays out the microfield concept, distinguishes the roles of ions and electrons as perturbers, states the typical simplifying assumptions used in first-pass diagnostics, and introduces the Holtsmark distribution as the archetypal conceptual model for microfields in an idealized plasma.

4.1 The microfield concept: many charges, no single "E"

In a plasma, the electric field experienced by an atom or ion is generated by nearby charged particles—ions and electrons—whose positions and velocities are constantly changing. Even if the plasma has a macroscopic electric field (for example, in a sheath near a boundary), the **microscopic local field** at the scale relevant for Stark perturbations is dominated by the nearest neighbors. Two emitters sitting a few microns apart in the same plasma can experience significantly different instantaneous microfields because the closest ions to each emitter are arranged differently at that moment.

This is the first conceptual pivot: the Stark effect in a plasma is not driven by a single deterministic field but by **a random field drawn from a distribution**. That distribution is not arbitrary; it is shaped by density, charge state, temperature, screening, and correlations among particles. But it remains a distribution. Consequently:

- A "Stark-split line" is not a small set of discrete components at fixed offsets; it is often a **broadened profile** because different emitters contribute different offsets depending on their microfield realization.
- The line shape encodes both **how strongly the emitter responds** to the field and **how the plasma supplies fields** statistically.
- Inference becomes an inverse problem: you observe a line profile (or a line termination point) and infer a property of the plasma that controls the microfield statistics—most notably density.

It also clarifies why “line dissolution” is a natural outcome at high n. The microfield distribution always has a tail: rare configurations produce stronger-than-typical fields. High-n states amplify the impact of those fields. Even if the *typical* microfield would only broaden modestly, the tail can contribute enough large perturbations to fill in gaps and destroy resolution.

4.2 Ion microfields vs electron impacts: slow vs fast perturbers

A second pivot is dynamical. Ions and electrons do not merely differ by charge sign; they differ drastically in mass and therefore in typical velocity at a given temperature. That velocity difference changes how each species perturbs the emitter.

- **Ions as “slow” perturbers:** Because ions are heavy, their motion is relatively slow on the timescale of radiative transitions. For many spectral lines, the ion microfield can be treated as approximately **quasi-static** during the emission event. That makes ions natural sources of a slowly varying field that produces Stark splitting/broadening that resembles an ensemble of “frozen-in” fields across many emitters. In simplified treatments, ions set the **microfield distribution**.
- **Electrons as “fast” perturbers:** Electrons are light and fast, and their encounters with emitters are often rapid. Their effect is frequently described in an **impact** picture: many short, cumulative perturbations that broaden the line through collisional dynamics rather than through a quasi-static field that can be thought of as “present” during emission.

In real plasmas, both effects can matter simultaneously. The relative importance depends on plasma conditions and on the transition. A useful way to keep the story straight is to think in terms of timescales:

- If the perturbing field changes slowly compared to the emission process, it behaves quasi-statically and contributes a field distribution type broadening.
- If it changes rapidly, it behaves like stochastic kicks (collisional impact broadening), contributing to linewidth through frequency modulation and phase interruption.

The graphic you asked about earlier explicitly says “ions only, electrons neglected,” which signals a deliberate simplification: treat the microfield as quasi-static and set by ions. That approximation is often a first step because it produces a relatively clean scaling relation (like Inglis–Teller) connecting the observable termination point to density. The price is that it can understate or misattribute broadening when electron impacts are important, especially in hotter or denser plasmas where electron collision rates are high.

4.3 Typical assumptions: quasi-neutrality and singly charged ions

To turn the qualitative microfield picture into a usable diagnostic, one usually introduces a set of pragmatic assumptions. They are not universally true, but they are often reasonable starting points.

- **Quasi-neutrality:** Most bulk plasmas are approximately quasi-neutral on scales larger than the Debye length: electron density is close to the total ion charge density. In the simplest single-species case, this becomes the familiar approximation **Ne ≈ Ni**. This is what allows an ion-microfield-based relation to be used as an **electron density diagnostic** in many contexts: you infer an ion density from microfields and then translate it to electron density by quasi-neutrality.
- **Singly charged ions:** The simplest microfield scaling assumes ions carry charge +e (charge state Z=1). In more ionized plasmas, higher Z increases microfield strengths at the same number density because each ion's Coulomb field scales with its charge. The microfield distribution and its characteristic field scale therefore depend on effective charge and on the mixture of species.
- **Neglect of strong correlations and screening in first pass:** Idealized microfield models often assume ions are randomly distributed (subject to overall density) without strong spatial correlations. Real plasmas have screening (Debye shielding) and Coulomb correlations that can reduce extreme fields compared with a purely random distribution. In many practical cases, the simplest model still provides a good first-order scaling, and refinements are treated as corrections.

These assumptions are not merely technical; they determine what the inferred "density" means. Under quasi-neutrality and Z=1, the density inferred from the last resolved hydrogen line can be read as the electron density. In a multi-ion, high-Z plasma, the same observation must be interpreted more carefully: the microfields may be stronger than the Z=1 model predicts, shifting n_max even if Ne is unchanged.

4.4 Microfield distributions (Holtsmark picture) at a conceptual level

The Holtsmark distribution is the canonical "first model" for the microfield magnitude in a plasma of randomly located ions. Conceptually, it answers a simple question: if ions are scattered in space with a given number density, what is the probability that the net electric field at a point has magnitude F?

The key conceptual features of the Holtsmark picture—without needing to write the full formula—are:

- **Nearest neighbors dominate the tail.** Because the Coulomb field grows rapidly at short distance, rare events where an ion happens to be unusually close contribute

disproportionately to large microfields. This produces a distribution with a heavy tail: strong fields are uncommon, but not exponentially suppressed in the way they would be in many "Gaussian" random processes.

- **A characteristic field scale set by density.** There is a natural typical microfield magnitude that increases with ion density, roughly because the typical inter-ion spacing shrinks as density rises, and the field from a charge scales inversely with distance squared. The exact scaling depends on the statistical model, but the qualitative point is robust: denser plasmas supply stronger typical microfields.
- **Direction is random, magnitude is distributed.** Since ions are arranged randomly, the microfield direction is essentially isotropic when averaged over many emitters, while the magnitude follows the Holtsmark-like distribution. That isotropy supports the idea that line broadening can be treated as an average over many field orientations.
- **Screening and correlations modify the ideal distribution.** Real plasmas are not infinite, uncorrelated ion gases. Debye screening reduces the influence of far-away charges and correlations reduce the likelihood of extremely close approaches, which can soften the tail. But the Holtsmark picture remains the conceptual baseline: a microfield distribution whose scale is set primarily by density and charge state.

Why does this matter for Inglis–Teller? Because the "last resolved line" is not controlled by a single microfield magnitude; it is controlled by the interplay between the **distribution** of fields and the **field response** of high-n levels. A steep n-dependence means that even a modest broadening at lower n can become catastrophic at higher n, and the heavy tail means that some fraction of emitters will always experience stronger fields than average—helping to fill in and blur the high-n region first.

In short, plasmas replace the clean Stark story—one field, one splitting—with a statistical story: many fields, many splittings, one observed profile. The next step is to use that statistical environment to formalize when discrete Rydberg lines lose identity and become a continuum, yielding the scaling relation behind the Inglis–Teller diagnostic.

5. From Stark Splitting to Line Broadening and Line Dissolution

In a textbook Stark experiment, you picture a clean line splitting into a tidy set of components as the field is increased. In a plasma, you can begin with the same microscopic picture—an atom in a field has split/shifted levels—but the macroscopic observation often looks nothing like a tidy multiplet. Instead, the line swells, develops wings, blurs into neighbors, and eventually the entire high-n end of a hydrogen series stops looking like a sequence of lines at all. This is not because the Stark effect "stops being splitting"; it is because **an ensemble of emitters**

experiences a distribution of fields, and the spectrum you record is an average over all those realizations (plus additional time averaging). In that averaging process, deterministic splitting is converted into statistical broadening, and at high n the broadening becomes so severe that the discrete line concept fails. This section formalizes that progression: splitting → broadening → overlap → dissolution → quasi-continuum.

5.1 Why randomness turns splitting into broadening

Imagine, first, an idealized experiment where every emitter sees the same field magnitude and orientation. Then Stark splitting is crisp: each allowed component lands at a definite frequency, and the spectrum contains resolved peaks whose spacing encodes the field strength. Now replace the uniform field with a plasma microfield. Two things change immediately:

- **Different emitters see different fields.** The field magnitude and direction vary from one emission event to the next because the local ion configuration differs. Therefore the Stark shifts/splittings differ event-by-event. Even if each individual event produces a discrete set of components, the positions of those components vary across the ensemble. The recorded spectrum becomes the superposition of many slightly different multiplets—i.e., a broadened envelope.
- **The field varies during emission.** In addition to spatial variation across emitters, there can be temporal variation (especially from fast electrons). If the field changes appreciably on the emission timescale, it introduces additional "smearing" through dynamical dephasing, frequency modulation, or collisional interruption. Whether this is treated as quasi-static (ions) or impact (electrons), the common outcome is the same: narrower discrete components are replaced by a broader line shape.

The key conceptual step is that the plasma does not erase the Stark structure at the microscopic level; it **randomizes** it. The spectral signature therefore shifts from "component positions" to "profile statistics." In controlled spectroscopy, you read off a splitting and infer a field. In plasma spectroscopy, you often read off a width, shape, or termination point and infer a density (or microfield scale).

5.2 The meaning of "overlap": when components become indistinguishable

The word "overlap" sounds trivial—two peaks get close and merge—but in the Stark/microfield context it marks a deeper loss of information. There are two overlapping processes:

- **Internal overlap within a single transition's Stark pattern.** Even for a fixed n → n′ transition, Stark mixing can distribute strength across many components. In a stochastic field environment, those components are broadened and shifted in many different ways. The resulting envelope can become smooth enough that no individual component is

experimentally recoverable, even in principle, because the ensemble averaging washes out the discrete structure.

- **External overlap between adjacent transitions in a series.** Hydrogen series lines are already converging as n increases. When the Stark-broadened envelope of the n → n′ line becomes comparable to the spacing between the n → n′ and (n+1) → n′ lines, those two lines begin to blend. At that point, "which line is which" becomes ambiguous; the spectrum stops being a set of separable transitions and becomes a continuous band.

Overlap is therefore not just an instrumental limitation. Instrument resolution matters, of course, but the key point is that the emitter's response plus the plasma microfield distribution can produce a physical width that outruns the natural separation. Once the intrinsic profiles physically blend, increasing instrumental resolution cannot resurrect discrete lines that no longer exist as distinct features.

This is why the Inglis–Teller diagnostic is robust: it relies on a qualitative threshold—where the line series ceases to be separable—that corresponds to a genuine physical crossover between "distinct transitions" and "blended band." The exact value of n at which you declare the threshold may depend on signal-to-noise and resolution, but the existence of a steep transition is rooted in physics, not just instrumentation.

5.3 The physical threshold: mixing within n-manifolds and between n-levels

To understand why high-n lines are the first to dissolve, it helps to separate two kinds of mixing that the electric field causes.

- **Mixing within an n-manifold:** In an ideal hydrogenic system, many states share the same n energy. A field couples them strongly, reorganizing the manifold into new field-aligned eigenstates. This produces a spread of energies within what was previously a single degenerate level, and thus spreads transition frequencies. At moderate n and modest fields, this reorganization still yields a recognizable "family" of Stark-shifted transitions associated with that n.
- **Mixing between neighboring n-levels:** As n increases, the spacing between n and n+1 shrinks rapidly. At sufficiently high n, the field's coupling no longer stays confined inside one n-manifold; it reaches across to adjacent n levels. When this happens, the very label n begins to lose meaning. The "upper level" in a transition is no longer predominantly n; it is a field-dressed mixture spanning multiple n values. Transition strengths and energies become densely interwoven across what used to be separate lines.

The line dissolution threshold corresponds to the point where these two mixings effectively fuse into one phenomenon: the field does not merely split a level; it **destabilizes level identity**. In other words, the perturbation is no longer "a correction" to a well-separated ladder; it is a

reshuffling of a densely packed spectrum. Once the eigenstates extend significantly across adjacent n values, discrete series membership becomes ambiguous and the spectrum becomes dense enough to appear continuous.

This is the physical meaning behind the “balancing” intuition used in Inglis–Teller scaling: dissolution begins when a typical Stark energy scale becomes comparable to the separation between adjacent principal levels. But it is more than a numeric equality; it is the onset of cross-manifold mixing that erodes the taxonomy of levels itself.

5.4 Quasi-continuum formation and the disappearance of discrete lines

As the dissolution progresses, the spectral series approaches a quasi-continuum in a very specific way. It is not that emission stops; it is that emission no longer parcels itself into separated, countable lines.

Several effects conspire to produce the quasi-continuum:

- **Density of transitions explodes.** High-n regions contain many closely spaced lines even before Stark effects. Field mixing further increases the number of accessible transitions by redistributing state character and relaxing what would otherwise be strict selection constraints. The spectrum becomes crowded not only because the series converges, but because the “network” of allowed transitions becomes richer under mixing.
- **Profiles broaden and fill the gaps.** The microfield distribution produces broad wings and envelopes that extend into the spaces between nominal line centers. As n increases, the natural line spacing shrinks while the microfield-driven width grows, so the gaps between lines are the first casualties.
- **Bound–free boundary becomes blurred.** High-n states sit near the ionization threshold. In a strong or fluctuating field, these near-threshold states can be effectively “pushed” into continuum-like behavior. Even without literal ionization in every event, the spectroscopic distinction between very weakly bound states and free states becomes less sharp. The spectrum near the series limit therefore looks increasingly like continuum emission with superposed structure, rather than like discrete lines approaching a limit.

The observational end state is that the high-n portion of a hydrogen series loses its individuality. Instead of line #15, #16, #17, you see a smeared band rising toward the series limit, often merging into the general continuum background. The **last resolved line** is the last place where the discrete picture is still stable enough that the spectrum shows separable peaks. Beyond it, the emission may still carry microphysical information, but not in a form that can be reliably indexed by n without detailed line-shape modeling.

This is the conceptual heart of the Inglis–Teller method: the disappearance of discrete lines is not merely “bad resolution.” It is a physically meaningful signature that the plasma microfield environment has become strong enough—relative to high-n level spacing—that hydrogenic structure transitions from a discrete ladder to an effectively continuous band. In the next section, that threshold is turned into a scaling relation that links the observable n_max to the plasma density.

6. Deriving the Inglis–Teller Scaling Without Getting Lost

The Inglis–Teller relation looks mysterious the first time you see it because it combines three ingredients that live in different “dialects”: hydrogenic level spacing, Stark response of Rydberg states, and plasma microfield statistics. The good news is that you do not need a full line-shape theory to understand why the result is so steep in n. A clean, almost back-of-the-envelope derivation already gets you to the essential scaling $N \propto n^{(-15/2)}$. What follows is that derivation, with just enough structure to show where each power comes from and what is hiding inside the numerical constant.

6.1 The balancing idea: Stark scale equals adjacent-level spacing scale

The “last resolved line” criterion is fundamentally a balance of two energy (or frequency) scales.

- One scale is the intrinsic separation between neighboring principal levels, $\Delta E_{spacing}$, which shrinks rapidly with n.
- The other scale is the characteristic Stark-induced spread of energies (or transition frequencies) produced by a typical plasma microfield, ΔE_{Stark}, which grows rapidly with n for hydrogenic Rydberg states.

The Inglis–Teller idea is to identify a threshold $n = n_{max}$ at which these two scales become comparable in magnitude:

$$\Delta E_{Stark}(n_{max}) \approx \Delta E_{spacing}(n_{max})$$

This is not claiming a sharp phase transition. It is a practical diagnostic criterion: once the field-induced spread within and around the n-manifold is comparable to the spacing between n and n+1, then the n and (n+1) lines will overlap strongly and discrete line identity will begin to fail. That is exactly what the observer reports as “the series has merged.”

So the derivation is a three-step pipeline:

1. estimate $\Delta E_{spacing}$ as a function of n,
2. estimate ΔE_{Stark} as a function of n and microfield strength F,

3. estimate typical F as a function of density N, then combine them.

6.2 Where the steep n-power comes from (n-sensitivity vs n-spacing)
The steep n-dependence is not an accident; it comes from multiplying two strong trends.

Adjacent-level spacing shrinks like n^(-3)
Hydrogenic binding energies scale approximately as 1/n^2, so the spacing between adjacent levels behaves like the derivative with respect to n, giving a large-n scaling:

ΔE_spacing ~ 1/n^3

(Up to a constant factor set by the Rydberg energy scale. The key point is the n^(-3).)

Stark energy scale grows like n^(2) times field strength
For hydrogenic Rydberg states, the Stark effect is unusually strong because of near-degeneracy within an n-manifold. In that situation the field effectively reorganizes many states, producing an energy spread across the manifold that scales roughly as:

ΔE_Stark ~ n^2 * F

Here F is the local electric field magnitude (the microfield). The exact coefficient depends on which subset of Stark components you are tracking and what you mean by the "typical spread," but the scaling n^2 is the crucial piece: higher n states are dramatically more field-sensitive.

Plasma microfield scale grows like N^(2/3)
In a simple ion microfield picture, the characteristic distance to neighboring ions scales like r ~ N^(-1/3). The Coulomb field from a nearby ion scales like 1/r^2, so a characteristic field magnitude scales as:

F ~ 1/r^2 ~ (N^(-1/3))^(-2) = N^(2/3)

Again, the coefficient depends on the microfield model (random uncorrelated ions vs screened/correlated ions), but the N^(2/3) scaling is the robust geometric backbone.

Combine the three scalings
Now impose the balance criterion:

ΔE_Stark ~ ΔE_spacing
n^2 * F ~ 1/n^3
F ~ 1/n^5

But F ~ N^(2/3), so:

N^(2/3) ~ 1/n^5
N ~ 1/n^(15/2)

That is the origin of the famous exponent 15/2. It is simply (5)*(3/2), where 5 comes from matching n^2 to n^(-3), and 3/2 comes from inverting the 2/3 power in the microfield–density relation.

This also explains why the diagnostic is so sensitive: a small change in n_max corresponds to a large change in inferred density because the dependence is a steep power law.

6.3 The canonical form: N · n^(15/2) = constant · a0^(-3)

Once you keep the constants rather than only the scalings, the balance becomes a statement in absolute units. A convenient way to express it is in atomic units, where the Bohr radius a0 sets the natural length scale and a0^(-3) sets a natural density scale.

The commonly quoted canonical form is:

N * n^(15/2) = C * a0^(-3)

In the graphic you shared (with "ions only, electrons neglected"), the constant is written as approximately:

C ≈ 0.027

So:

N * n^(15/2) ≈ 0.027 * a0^(-3)

Conceptually, this equation says: "If the last resolvable line corresponds to principal quantum number n, then the ion density N is fixed by how large the microfields must be to dissolve that n-manifold into its neighbors."

Two details are worth keeping straight:

- This N is fundamentally tied to the **microfield-producing charges** (often ions in the quasi-static picture). In quasi-neutral plasmas, it is then mapped to electron density via Ne ≈ Ni (or more generally Ne ≈ Z_eff * Ni).
- The appearance of a0^(-3) is not cosmetic. It's a reminder that we are comparing atomic structure (set by a0) to plasma structure (set by interparticle spacing), and the diagnostic is really about the ratio of those two length scales.

6.4 What the constant encodes: microfield model and approximation choices

The exponent 15/2 is the robust, structural result. The numerical constant C is where all the "messy reality" gets swept—necessarily—into a single number. In practice, C depends on several choices and approximations.

Definition of the dissolution threshold
You must decide what “equal” means in the balance ΔE_Stark ≈ ΔE_spacing. Is it equality at the half-width? At some percentile of the microfield distribution? Does “last resolved” mean barely separable by eye, or separable at a specified resolving power and signal-to-noise? Different threshold conventions shift C.

Microfield statistics (Holtsmark vs screened/correlated)
If you assume ions are randomly distributed with negligible correlations, you get a Holtsmark-type field distribution with a particular characteristic scale. If you include Debye screening or strong coupling/correlation effects, the probability of very large fields is modified, and the effective field scale changes. That shifts C (and can make the “ions only” approximation more or less accurate).

Charge state and mixtures
The simple form assumes singly charged ions. If the plasma contains ions with charge Z > 1, microfields at the same number density are stronger, which effectively moves dissolution to lower n. In a mixed plasma, one often replaces “ion density” with an effective charge-weighted density; doing so changes the constant that multiplies a0^(-3).

Electron contributions and impact broadening
Neglecting electrons is a deliberate simplification. Electrons can broaden lines through rapid collisions (impact broadening) and can also contribute to microfields in some regimes. Including electrons does not usually change the n^(15/2) logic (the geometric and hydrogenic scalings still dominate), but it changes the mapping between observed line termination and inferred density, effectively modifying C and sometimes the practical interpretation of “what density” you are measuring.

Instrumental and radiative-transfer effects folded into an empirical threshold
Even when the physics sets a real dissolution tendency, the observed n_max is influenced by resolution, blending, optical depth, and continuum background. In practice, users of the method often treat C as partly empirical: calibrated or chosen to match a modeling convention consistent with their observational setup.

The takeaway is: the Inglis–Teller relation is powerful because the exponent is dictated by simple structure—hydrogenic compression, Rydberg Stark sensitivity, and geometric microfields. The constant is where your model lives. Knowing which assumptions produced your C is what lets you use the relation confidently rather than as a black box.

7. Practical Use as a Density Diagnostic

The Inglis–Teller method is attractive because it turns a visually accessible feature—the point where a hydrogen line series stops being resolvable—into a steeply sensitive density estimate. But because the observable is partly "human" (line identification, resolution limits, blending judgments), the method works best when you treat it as a disciplined workflow rather than as a single plug-and-chug formula. This section lays out that workflow: how to identify the last resolvable line, how to convert it into a density, what density you have actually inferred, and how to keep yourself honest with quick checks.

7.1 Step-by-step: identifying the last resolvable line in a series

A clean Inglis–Teller estimate begins with choosing the right part of the spectrum and being explicit about what "resolvable" means in your context.

Step 1: Choose a hydrogen series that is observable and reasonably clean

Balmer is often preferred in the visible; Paschen or higher series may be favored in the infrared; Lyman may be feasible in UV-capable setups. Choose a region where the series is strong enough that you can see multiple high-n members with decent signal-to-noise before the series limit.

Step 2: Confirm you are actually looking at hydrogenic lines

This sounds obvious, but in real spectra high-n regions can be cluttered with blends and weak features. You want to confirm the approximate spacing and convergence behavior matches the expected series pattern toward the correct limit. If the region is dominated by unidentified blends, the "last line" you pick may not be part of the series you think it is.

Step 3: Identify a run of consecutive members before the merger region

Do not jump directly to the highest-n region. First identify several consecutive lines at lower n where assignments are unambiguous. This anchors your n-counting and reduces the chance of mislabeling in the crowded high-n end.

Step 4: Define a practical resolvability criterion

In ideal theory, "resolved" means the profiles are distinct as physical objects. In practice, you need a criterion that is consistent with your data quality. Common practical criteria include:

- A visible local minimum between adjacent peaks that exceeds the noise floor by a comfortable margin.
- A fit with two adjacent line centers that remains stable (does not collapse into one line) under small changes in fitting window or baseline.
- A separation between adjacent line centers that exceeds some fraction of the measured linewidth (instrumental + physical) in a reproducible way.

The goal is consistency: you want the same standard applied across spectra and across observers.

Step 5: Locate the transition from resolvable lines to merged structure
As you move to higher n, you will see a point where adjacent members become only marginally distinct, then indistinguishable. The Inglis–Teller n_max is the last member that still satisfies your resolvability criterion. Record it as the upper level n of the transition, not the series label itself.

Step 6: Note and record confounders in the same breath
Before you compute anything, note whether:

- The continuum rises sharply near the limit.
- There is strong blending from other species.
- The instrument resolution changes across the band.
- The lines show self-absorption or radiative transfer effects.
  These notes matter because the method's main failure mode is mistaking "can't see it" for "it has physically dissolved."

7.2 Converting n_max into density (and what density, exactly)
Once you have n_max, you translate it to a density using the Inglis–Teller relation appropriate to your modeling assumptions. In the simplified "ions only" form shown in your graphic:

N * n_max^(15/2) = C * a0^(-3)

so

N = (C * a0^(-3)) / n_max^(15/2)

Here:

- N is the number density of the microfield-producing charges in the model (often interpreted as ion density in the quasi-static ion picture).
- a0 is the Bohr radius, included so that the result has correct dimensions and emphasizes the atomic length scale behind the diagnostic.
- C is a numerical factor that depends on the microfield model and threshold convention (in your graphic, C ≈ 0.027).

What density is it, exactly?
At first pass, think of the inferred N as the density that sets the characteristic microfield strength. In the simplest quasi-static model, that is the ion density. In quasi-neutral conditions,

that ion density maps directly to electron density (or to a charge-weighted electron density if ions are multiply charged). If the plasma is not quasi-neutral in the region producing the emission (e.g., sheath regions), the mapping becomes more subtle.

A practical way to speak precisely is:

- The method estimates an effective microfield density scale, and you then interpret it as an ion density or electron density depending on plasma composition and quasi-neutrality.

7.3 Ion density vs electron density: when Ne ≈ Ni is justified

Many users want Ne, the electron density, because it is a central plasma parameter. Inglis–Teller is often taught as an electron-density diagnostic because in many plasmas:

$$N_e \approx N_i$$

But that equivalence is a special case of quasi-neutrality under a single dominant ion charge state. The more careful statement is:

$$N_e \approx \Sigma(Z_i * N_i)$$

where N_i is the number density of ions of charge state Z_i. In a plasma dominated by singly charged ions, this reduces to $N_e \approx N_i$. If higher charge states matter, Ne can be substantially larger than the total ion number density, and the microfields can be stronger at fixed Ne because high-Z ions contribute larger fields.

When is Ne ≈ Ni reasonable?

- **Bulk plasma, away from boundaries:** Most interior regions of laboratory and astrophysical plasmas are quasi-neutral on scales larger than the Debye length, making Ne tied closely to ion charge density.
- **Single-species, low-Z ionization:** In hydrogen plasmas or low-ionization, singly charged conditions, Ne ≈ Ni is often an excellent approximation.
- **Emission region representative of the bulk:** The line emission must originate primarily from the quasi-neutral region you care about; if emission is dominated by boundary layers, the local charge balance may differ.

When you must be more cautious

- **Multiply ionized plasmas:** If significant fractions of ions have $Z > 1$, the inferred microfield scale must be interpreted with charge-state weighting.

- **Strong gradients or sheath-dominated emission:** Near surfaces, electric fields and charge separation can break the simple mapping.
- **Mixtures:** In mixed plasmas, "the" ion density is not unique; you care about the charge-weighted distribution and which species dominate microfields locally.

Practically, many users proceed by estimating N from Inglis–Teller and then reporting Ne with an explicit assumption: "Assuming quasi-neutrality and Z_eff ≈ 1, Ne ≈ N." That single sentence keeps the diagnostic honest.

7.4 Units, quick estimates, and sanity checks

Because the relation is steep, small mistakes in n_max can swing density estimates by factors of several. A disciplined unit handling and a couple of quick checks are essential.

Convenient unit forms

Using a0 in SI units, one can rewrite the "ions-only" form as a direct numerical estimate. With C ≈ 0.027, the density scale becomes:

N (m^-3) ≈ (1.83 × 10^29) / n_max^(7.5)

and in cgs:

N (cm^-3) ≈ (1.83 × 10^23) / n_max^(7.5)

These are handy because you can compute rough densities quickly without carrying atomic units explicitly.

Quick estimate mental math

Because n_max^(7.5) grows extremely fast, you can sanity-check by remembering a few anchor points:

- n_max around 10 implies densities in the 10^15–10^16 cm^-3 range (order of magnitude).
- n_max around 20 implies densities closer to 10^13 cm^-3 (order of magnitude).
  The exact numbers depend on the constant and the chosen threshold convention, but the trend is the key: doubling n_max drops inferred density by a huge factor.

Sanity check 1: Does the termination point move the right way?

If you change plasma conditions in a way you believe increases density, n_max should decrease (series terminates earlier). If your inferred density changes in the opposite direction, you may be misidentifying the series or the termination point.

Sanity check 2: Compare to independent density indicators when possible

If you have any alternative diagnostic—interferometry, Langmuir probe (where valid), Thomson

scattering, continuum emission models, or other line broadening estimates—compare orders of magnitude. Inglis–Teller is often reliable at the order-of-magnitude level in messy environments, but it should not land wildly outside the range suggested by independent measures unless you have a good reason.

Sanity check 3: Instrument and blending audit near the series limit
Ask two questions:

- Could the "disappearance" simply be that the instrument cannot resolve the growing crowding even if the physical widths were smaller?
- Could blending by other lines be creating an artificial "merger"?
  If the answer might be yes, your n_max is an upper bound on the dissolution threshold, and your density estimate becomes correspondingly uncertain.

Sanity check 4: Sensitivity to one-line ambiguity
Because the scaling is so steep, miscounting n_max by even one or two can matter. A practical habit is to compute density for n_max, n_max−1, and n_max+1 and treat that spread as a built-in uncertainty band. If the spread is unacceptably large for your application, you may need a more detailed line-shape modeling approach rather than relying purely on Inglis–Teller.

Taken together, these steps convert Inglis–Teller from a seductive one-liner into a trustworthy diagnostic method: identify n_max carefully, compute an effective density, interpret it with explicit charge-balance assumptions, and verify that the result behaves sensibly against both physics intuition and any independent checks available.

8. Connecting Back to Molecular Stark Spectroscopy

The easiest way to see the unity of the Stark effect across molecules and plasmas is to stop thinking in terms of "two different phenomena" and instead think in terms of "one interaction term viewed through two different experimental lenses." In both cases, an electric field mixes quantum states via the electric dipole interaction, producing shifts and splittings in transition energies and redistributing intensities. What changes is not the core physics but the *field architecture* (uniform versus random), the *inference posture* (field known versus field inferred), and the *spectral outcome* (deterministic multiplets versus statistical line shapes and dissolution thresholds). This section makes that bridge explicit and uses it to clarify why Inglis–Teller feels alien to someone trained on clean Stark spectra—while also showing that it is, in a deep sense, the same story told in reverse.

8.1 Controlled uniform fields vs stochastic plasma microfields

In molecular Stark spectroscopy, the field is engineered to be as close as possible to a known, uniform quantity. You build electrodes with carefully controlled spacing, design geometries that minimize gradients, calibrate voltages, and often work in controlled environments like molecular beams or low-pressure cells. The field is a *global knob*. Every molecule in the interaction region is intended to experience essentially the same E, so that "the spectrum at E = X" is a meaningful concept.

In plasmas, the electric field relevant to Stark broadening is a *local microfield*. Even if there is a macroscopic field present (sheaths, ambipolar fields, drift fields), the Stark effect that dissolves hydrogenic high-n structure is dominated by the near-field contributions of neighboring ions and electrons. That field is:

- **Spatially heterogeneous:** different emitters see different nearby charge configurations,
- **Temporally fluctuating:** the configuration changes as particles move,
- **Statistically describable:** you can speak meaningfully about typical field scales and distributions, but not about a single field value.

So the two contexts differ in how "E" enters the problem. In molecular Stark spectroscopy, E is an input you set, and you infer molecular parameters. In plasma Stark diagnostics, E is an emergent internal variable you do not directly control, and you infer plasma parameters (density, charge state, sometimes temperature or screening) from the ensemble-averaged spectral imprint.

That inversion is the conceptual bridge: it's the same interaction, but the direction of inference flips.

8.2 Clean multiplets vs broadened envelopes: why resolution differs

Why do molecules in an applied field often yield cleanly resolved Stark patterns, while plasma hydrogen lines often swell into broad wings and eventually dissolve?

The difference is not that "molecular Stark is splitting and plasma Stark is broadening." Both are splitting at the microscopic level. The difference is **coherence and uniformity of conditions**.

In the controlled-field case:

- Each molecule sees essentially the same field magnitude and direction.
- The Stark-shifted eigenstates are consistent across the ensemble.
- Transition frequencies cluster at well-defined values.

- With sufficient instrumental resolution, individual components can be resolved as distinct peaks.
- Intensities can be interpreted as deterministic consequences of the field-dressed eigenvectors.

In the microfield case:

- Each emitter sees a different instantaneous field magnitude and direction.
- The Stark pattern varies event-by-event.
- The recorded spectrum is a superposition over many Stark patterns drawn from a distribution.
- That ensemble averaging replaces discrete peaks with a **continuous or quasi-continuous envelope**.
- Even if you had infinite instrumental resolution, the profile could remain smooth because the physical distribution of component positions is itself continuous.

A helpful way to say it is: molecular Stark spectra are often limited by your spectrometer; plasma Stark spectra are often limited by the plasma's own statistical spread. This is why "resolution" means different things. In molecular work, improved resolution reveals more structure. In plasma work, improved resolution can reveal more accurate line shapes, but it cannot resurrect discrete components if the underlying distribution has already washed them out.

This is also why Inglis–Teller works: it deliberately focuses on a regime where the physical broadening becomes comparable to intrinsic level spacing, so the disappearance of resolvable structure reflects a real physical crossover, not merely an instrumental one.

8.3 Linear/quadratic parallels: orientation, polarizability, and degeneracy

The linear vs quadratic Stark distinction is one of the main conceptual connections between molecular and hydrogenic plasma cases, but it looks different in each setting because the source of degeneracy differs.

In molecular Stark spectroscopy:

- **Quadratic behavior** is common when a state is well isolated and has no permanent dipole expectation value due to symmetry. The field induces a dipole via mixing with opposite-parity states, giving an energy shift proportional to E^2. This is the "polarizability regime."

- **Linear behavior** often appears when there is a near-degenerate opposite-parity partner (doubling phenomena) or when the field is strong enough to mix a small manifold so that the molecule becomes oriented in the lab frame. This is “orientation via mixing,” and it can be used to measure permanent dipole moments and to manipulate molecular beams.

In hydrogenic (or near-hydrogenic) Rydberg states:

- The degeneracy is not a delicate doubling; it is a structural feature of the Coulomb problem. Within a fixed n manifold there are many states densely packed in energy.
- Because of that dense manifold, even modest fields can create effectively **linear Stark splitting** across the manifold: the field chooses a new basis of field-aligned states whose energies spread approximately in proportion to field strength.
- The “quadratic” story is still present at a formal level, but the practical observational signature at high n is dominated by strong mixing in a dense manifold—exactly the condition that produces large, often linear-like Stark spreads.

So the parallel is real: linear Stark behavior arises from degeneracy and strong mixing; quadratic Stark behavior arises from weak mixing of isolated states. The difference is that molecules often require special near-degeneracies or sufficiently strong applied fields to reach the linear regime, while hydrogenic Rydberg manifolds are naturally poised there because of their intrinsic density of states.

This also clarifies why the plasma case is so unforgiving: once you have a dense manifold plus random fields, you get strong spreading plus statistical averaging, and the spectrum quickly becomes a broadened envelope.

8.4 What “strong field” means in each context

The phrase “strong electric field” is deceptively context-dependent. In molecular spectroscopy, “strong” usually means strong enough to produce a measurable Stark shift relative to linewidths and to drive the system into a regime where state mixing or orientation is significant. You compare the Stark energy scale to rotational splittings, doubling splittings, or experimental linewidths, and you say the field is strong when it reorganizes the relevant molecular subspace.

In the plasma/Inglis–Teller context, “strong field” is not a global quantity but a statement about how microfields compare to **atomic level spacings** at a given n. A microfield can be “strong” with respect to n=20 while being “weak” with respect to n=3. That is why the high-n end dissolves first: the relevant comparison scale changes with n.

So a clean unifying definition of “strong” is:

- A field is strong when the field-induced coupling and resulting energy spread in the relevant subspace is comparable to or larger than the intrinsic energy separations that define that subspace.

Under that definition:

- In molecular Stark spectroscopy, strong means “reorganizes rotational or parity substructure.”
- In Inglis–Teller plasma spectroscopy, strong means “reorganizes and mixes high-n hydrogenic manifolds so that adjacent n levels overlap.”

This is the deep reason the two domains connect so naturally: both are doing the same comparison—field-driven mixing versus intrinsic structure—just with different structures and different sources of the field. And once you see that, the Inglis–Teller relation stops looking like a mysterious plasma trick and starts looking like a straightforward consequence of applying Stark logic to the most field-sensitive states nature provides.

9. Limitations, Failure Modes, and Interpretation Traps

The Inglis–Teller relation is powerful because it compresses complicated plasma and atomic physics into a steep, practical scaling: identify the last resolvable high-n hydrogenic line and infer a density. That same compression is also its main hazard. Many different effects can cause high-n lines to weaken, broaden, blend, or “disappear,” and not all of them are the Stark dissolution mechanism the relation assumes. The most common trap is to treat n_max as a pure plasma constant handed down by nature, when in reality it is a measurement extracted from a spectrum under finite resolution, noise, blending, and sometimes radiative transfer. This section lists the major limitations and shows how each can bias the inferred density, often in systematic directions.

9.1 Electron-impact broadening and when “ions only” breaks down

The “ions only, electrons neglected” version of the relation assumes that the dominant broadening and dissolution mechanism is driven by quasi-static ion microfields. That picture is often reasonable for line wings and for certain density/temperature regimes, but it can fail when electrons contribute significant broadening through rapid collisions.

How electron impacts change the story

Electrons are fast. Their interactions with emitters are often better described as a sequence of short perturbations rather than a quasi-static field. This produces **impact broadening**, which can add a substantial linewidth component even when ion microfields are moderate. In regimes where electron collisions are frequent and energetic, the total width of high-n lines can be

dominated by electron impact rather than by ion quasi-static broadening. The practical consequence is that lines may merge earlier (lower n_max) than an ion-only model would predict, leading you to **overestimate density** if you interpret the early merger as purely ion-microfield dissolution.

Signs that electron impacts may matter

- The line cores are unusually broad even at modest n, not just the high-n end.
- Broadening scales strongly with temperature (via electron velocities) rather than primarily with density.
- Different transitions show inconsistencies that a single microfield picture cannot reconcile (for example, widths do not scale with n in a way consistent with quasi-static ion microfields alone).
- The plasma is hot and/or dense enough that electron collision rates are high.

Interpretive discipline
A safe posture is: use the ion-only Inglis–Teller relation as a first-pass density indicator when the spectrum and plasma conditions plausibly place you in a quasi-static regime, but treat it as an **effective density** when electron impacts are non-negligible. In mixed regimes, a more complete Stark-broadening model (with both ion and electron contributions) is the correct tool.

9.2 Non-hydrogenic emitters, ionic species, and departures from hydrogenic scaling
The steep n-scaling behind Inglis–Teller depends on hydrogenic structure: dense Rydberg manifolds, near-degeneracy patterns, and the $1/n^2$ energy structure that yields $1/n^3$ adjacent-level spacing.

What breaks if the emitter is not hydrogenic

- **Quantum defects:** In many atoms and ions, the effective potential is not purely Coulombic because of core penetration and polarization. Low angular-momentum Rydberg states can be shifted significantly relative to the hydrogenic ladder, altering both level spacings and field sensitivities. The high-n pattern may still converge, but not with the same clean scaling.
- **Fine structure and core effects:** Additional splitting scales can compete with or complicate the field mixing that underlies the “dissolution threshold.”
- **Ionic species with different Z:** Hydrogen-like ions retain hydrogenic structure but with scaled energies and radii. The atomic length and energy scales shift with effective nuclear charge, changing where dissolution occurs for a given plasma microfield scale. If

you blindly apply a hydrogen constant to a non-hydrogenic species, you can misinfer density by large factors.

Practical trap
Assuming “it looks like a converging series so it must behave hydrogenically.” Convergence is common; hydrogenic scaling is special. The Inglis–Teller exponent is robust for hydrogenic emitters; it is not guaranteed for complex atoms with large quantum defects.

9.3 Optical depth, instrument resolution, and blending not caused by Stark physics
Some of the most common ways to misidentify n_max have nothing to do with microfields at all.

Instrument resolution and line crowding
Even in a hypothetical zero-density plasma, high-n lines crowd together near the series limit. If your spectrometer cannot resolve the natural spacing, the series will appear to merge early. In that case, the inferred density is biased **high** because the method assumes physical broadening created the merger.

A useful mental model is: the observed merger is caused by whichever is larger—physical width or instrumental width—relative to line spacing. If instrumental width dominates, Inglis–Teller becomes an instrument-limited measure, not a plasma-limited one.

Blending from other species
In real plasmas (especially astrophysical), high-n regions can be cluttered with lines from other elements, molecular bands, or telluric features. A blend can mimic a broadened hydrogen member, obscure the local minima between adjacent lines, or create an apparent smooth band. Again, the danger is interpreting this as Stark dissolution and biasing density upward.

Optical depth and radiative transfer effects
If the plasma is optically thick in some lines, you can get self-absorption, line flattening, and profile distortions that reduce the visibility of high-n peaks. The last “visible” line might then be determined by radiative transfer rather than by microfield dissolution. Depending on the direction of the effect, you might misinfer density (often high, if high-n members are suppressed).

Practical safeguards

- Compare the observed linewidths to your known instrumental resolution.
- Look for consistent series behavior (multiple consecutive members) rather than an isolated “last line.”

- Check whether the same termination point appears across different observations, instruments, or viewing angles; instrument-limited termination often changes with setup.

9.4 Temperature, plasma inhomogeneity, and time variability

Even if Stark dissolution is truly the dominant physical mechanism, real plasmas are rarely uniform.

Temperature effects

Temperature affects Doppler broadening and, more importantly in many contexts, electron-impact broadening rates and ion/electron velocity distributions. A hotter plasma can produce broader lines without necessarily having higher density. If your interpretation assumes broadening is microfield-dominated, temperature-driven broadening can masquerade as higher density.

Inhomogeneity along the line of sight

Spectra are typically integrated over a path through the plasma. If density varies along that path, different regions contribute different n_max tendencies. Because the Inglis–Teller dependence is steep, the emission may be disproportionately influenced by the densest regions (which dissolve high-n lines earliest) or by the brightest regions (which may not coincide with the densest). The inferred density can therefore become a weighted, non-obvious “effective” value rather than the simple average.

Time variability

In pulsed plasmas, discharges, or dynamic astrophysical environments, density and temperature may change on timescales comparable to acquisition. You may be recording a time-average spectrum in which the high-n termination reflects a mixture of states. The result can be an n_max that corresponds to no single physical condition, and the inferred density becomes an average of a highly nonlinear diagnostic—often a poor proxy for the average physical density.

9.5 The danger of over-reading a single n_max measurement

Because the scaling is steep, a single n_max can feel decisive. That is the last major trap.

The steep exponent magnifies small ambiguities

If you misidentify n_max by one or two (easy to do in crowded regions), the inferred density can shift by large factors. If your spectrum has marginal resolution, noise, or blending, “the last resolvable line” can be partly subjective. Treating that one number as a precise density is unwarranted.

n_max is not a universal constant of the plasma

It is a property of the plasma *as observed through a specific instrument and geometry*, and

sometimes of a specific time interval. If the spectrum changes with viewing angle, time window, or resolution, n_max will change even if the underlying plasma parameters are broadly similar.

Best practice: report an uncertainty band, not a single value
A disciplined approach is to compute density for n_max and for plausible alternatives (n_max±1, sometimes ±2) and treat that spread as an uncertainty band or sensitivity report. If that band is too wide for your scientific purpose, it is a sign that Inglis–Teller should be supplemented (or replaced) with a fuller line-shape analysis or an independent diagnostic.

Best practice: triangulate
If possible, compare the Inglis–Teller estimate with at least one other density indicator or with model-based Stark line-shape fitting in a region where profiles are measurable. Inglis–Teller is excellent for rapid estimates and for regimes where detailed fitting is hard, but it should not be treated as an oracle when the observational conditions are marginal.

Taken together, these limitations do not weaken the method; they clarify when it is being used as intended. Inglis–Teller is at its best when high-n termination is clearly physical (not instrument-limited), when hydrogenic assumptions are justified, and when the plasma conditions place ion microfields in a leading role. When those conditions are not met, n_max still carries information—but only if you interpret it as an effective, model-dependent diagnostic rather than a single definitive density number.

10. Worked Examples and Thought Experiments

The most useful way to internalize Inglis–Teller is to do a few concrete computations and a few "impossible experiments" in your head. The computations show you how quickly density moves when n_max changes by only a couple of integers. The thought experiments show you that the plasma case is not alien; it is what molecular Stark spectroscopy would look like if you replaced your carefully uniform field with a randomized, locally varying field drawn from a distribution. Together they make the method feel less like a magic formula and more like a predictable consequence of two trends: hydrogenic level crowding and high-n field sensitivity.

Throughout, we will use the "ions only" canonical form consistent with your graphic:

N (cm^-3) ≈ (1.83 × 10^23) / n_max^(7.5)

This comes from N * n^(15/2) = 0.027 a0^(-3) and converting a0 to cgs units. Treat the numerical prefactor as model-dependent; the point of the examples is the scaling behavior.

10.1 A Balmer-series example: estimating density from n_max

Suppose you record a visible spectrum of a hydrogen-rich plasma and you can clearly assign Balmer lines well into the high-n region. You step upward in n and find that lines remain

separable up through the transition whose upper level is n = 12 (i.e., the Balmer member 12 → 2), but by n = 13 and above the peaks are no longer cleanly separable and the region becomes a blended band.

You therefore take:

n_max = 12

Compute the density:

N ≈ (1.83 × 10^23) / 12^(7.5) cm^-3

To get a feel without a calculator, break 12^(7.5) into 12^7 × 12^0.5.

- 12^2 = 144
- 12^4 = 144^2 ≈ 2.07 × 10^4
- 12^7 = 12^4 × 12^3 ≈ (2.07 × 10^4) × 1728 ≈ 3.58 × 10^7
- 12^0.5 ≈ 3.46
  So 12^(7.5) ≈ 3.58 × 10^7 × 3.46 ≈ 1.24 × 10^8

Then:

N ≈ (1.83 × 10^23) / (1.24 × 10^8) ≈ 1.48 × 10^15 cm^-3

So a “last resolved Balmer line” around n ≈ 12 corresponds, in this simplified model, to an ion density of order 10^15 cm^-3. If the plasma is quasi-neutral and singly ionized, you would report Ne ≈ 10^15 cm^-3 as a first-pass electron density estimate.

Two practical notes immediately follow:

- If you are uncertain whether n_max is 11 or 12 (a common ambiguity in crowded regions), the inferred density swings noticeably.
- This is why users often quote an uncertainty band computed from n_max±1 rather than a single number.

10.2 Comparing two plasmas with different n_max: why the scaling is so steep

Now compare two plasmas observed with the same instrument and similar line-of-sight geometry:

- Plasma A: n_max = 10
- Plasma B: n_max = 14

You can compute densities, but the real lesson is the ratio. Because:

N ∝ 1 / n^(7.5)

the ratio is:

N_A / N_B = (n_B / n_A)^(7.5) = (14/10)^(7.5)

Estimate (14/10) = 1.4. Now:

1.4^2 = 1.96
1.4^4 ≈ 1.96^2 ≈ 3.84
1.4^7 ≈ 1.4^4 × 1.4^3 ≈ 3.84 × (1.4^3=2.744) ≈ 10.5
1.4^7.5 ≈ 1.4^7 × √1.4 ≈ 10.5 × 1.183 ≈ 12.4

So Plasma A is about **12× denser** than Plasma B, even though n_max differs by only 4.

That steepness is the entire reason the method is attractive: the observable is easy (identify a termination point), and the inferred quantity responds dramatically to small changes in that termination point. It is also the reason the method is fragile: if your n_max identification is off by a couple of integers, the density can jump by factors of several.

To see this fragility, consider a one-step mistake:

N(n) / N(n+1) = ((n+1)/n)^(7.5)

At n ≈ 12, (13/12)^(7.5) ≈ (1.0833)^(7.5) ≈ ~1.8 (roughly). So a one-line ambiguity can mean nearly a factor of two in density. That is not a failure of the method; it is the cost of an extremely sensitive diagnostic.

10.3 What changes if the series is Paschen instead of Balmer

The underlying physics behind Inglis–Teller does not care whether the lower level is n=2 (Balmer) or n=3 (Paschen). The dissolution threshold is primarily about the **upper level n** becoming so field-sensitive and so closely spaced that adjacent-n structure collapses. So in the cleanest theoretical sense, “n_max is n_max,” independent of which series you use—if you can identify the same upper n.

What *does* change is the observational and practical side:

- **Wavelength region:** Paschen lines are in the infrared, which can be advantageous in dusty environments or where visible lines are optically thick or heavily blended.
- **Instrument resolution and detector response:** Your effective resolving power and noise characteristics may differ in IR vs visible, changing whether the termination you observe is physically driven or instrument-limited.

- **Continuum and background:** The continuum level and competing features can differ, affecting how far up the series you can confidently assign lines.
- **Population and radiative transfer:** The lower level n=3 may be populated differently than n=2 under certain plasma conditions, affecting line strengths. In some cases the Paschen high-n tail may be cleaner (less self-absorbed), allowing a more reliable n_max determination.

A useful thought experiment is this: if you had an ideal spectrometer with identical resolving power and signal-to-noise across wavelengths, and if both Balmer and Paschen series were equally observable, the inferred density from n_max should agree. In practice, differences between the two series' inferred densities are often telling you about observational limitations or radiative transfer, not about a breakdown of the Stark dissolution concept.

So the practical advice is: choose the series that gives you the cleanest, most confidently assigned high-n termination in your actual measurement environment. The physics is the same; the measurement conditions are not.

10.4 A "molecular Stark" analog: what an equivalent random field would do

Here is the bridge back to molecular Stark spectroscopy, framed as an "alternate universe" experiment.

In the laboratory, you apply a uniform field E0 and observe a clean Stark multiplet. Now imagine replacing the uniform field with a randomized field: each molecule experiences a field drawn from a distribution centered around E0 but with substantial spread, and with random orientations. For concreteness, imagine that on each measurement event the molecule experiences a slightly different field magnitude and direction, with a probability distribution similar in spirit to a plasma microfield distribution.

What happens to your beautiful multiplet?

- **Component positions become smeared:** Each Stark component shifts by an amount that depends on E. If E varies across the ensemble, each component becomes a broadened feature rather than a sharp peak.
- **Orientation averaging smooths structure:** Random field directions mix M-sublevels differently and wash out polarization-dependent selection patterns.
- **Near-degenerate manifolds become especially vulnerable:** If your molecule has closely spaced opposite-parity partners that produce near-linear Stark shifts, then small fluctuations in E produce large fluctuations in line positions. Those clean linear patterns quickly blur into broad envelopes.

- **At high sensitivity, lines overlap:** If you now imagine transitions whose Stark sensitivity grows across a ladder of states (an analog of increasing n), the "higher" states would broaden more, their peaks would crowd, and eventually the spectrum would stop looking like discrete lines at all.

That is the plasma story, translated into the molecular dialect: take a system with high field sensitivity and place it in a stochastic field environment, and the deterministic Stark multiplet becomes a statistical line shape. If you further engineer a ladder where intrinsic level spacings shrink while field sensitivity grows (the hydrogenic high-n situation), then there will be a clear termination region where discrete structure becomes impossible and the spectrum becomes quasi-continuous.

So the Inglis–Teller diagnostic is, in spirit, exactly what you would do in this alternate-universe molecular experiment: rather than extracting dipole moments from clean splitting under known E, you would infer the width of the field distribution (and thus something about the environment) from where the system's most field-sensitive transitions cease to be resolvable.

The worked examples and the thought experiment share the same moral: nothing "new" is being invoked in plasmas. The Stark effect is doing the same thing it always does—mixing states and shifting energies. The difference is that plasmas replace the single controllable E with an internal distribution of E, and hydrogenic Rydberg structure makes that distribution visible as a sharp, density-dependent series termination.

11. Broader Context: Where Inglis–Teller Shows Up

The Inglis–Teller relation is one of those rare tools that survives outside the environment that birthed it. It appears anywhere hydrogenic series lines are visible, high-n members approach a series limit, and electric microfields are strong enough to smear the Rydberg ladder. That includes wildly different settings: stellar photospheres and white dwarf atmospheres, diffuse nebulae, gas discharges and arcs, and the edge regions of fusion devices. The common thread is not a shared "kind of plasma," but a shared *spectral situation*: high-n hydrogenic structure interacting with a stochastic field environment.

11.1 Astrophysical applications: stellar atmospheres and nebular plasmas

In astrophysics, Inglis–Teller most often shows up as part of the broader enterprise of extracting plasma conditions from hydrogen line series. In stellar atmospheres, especially for hot stars where Balmer lines are strong and pressure broadening is significant, the high-n end of the Balmer series can provide a density-sensitive termination point. The same underlying physics—microfield-driven Stark broadening and dissolution—helps explain why the series does not continue cleanly all the way to the limit even when signal-to-noise is high.

In dense atmospheres, the method becomes particularly intuitive: the higher the density, the earlier the series merges. In lower-density environments such as some nebular plasmas, the high-n members may remain visible to larger n, and the termination can shift far upward. In practice, observers often use the presence or absence of high-n lines as a coarse but meaningful constraint on density, sometimes as a consistency check alongside other diagnostics. The key astrophysical challenge is disentangling true dissolution from radiative transfer complications and blending, since real spectra are line-of-sight integrals across gradients in temperature, density, and ionization state.

11.2 Laboratory plasmas: discharges, arcs, and fusion-edge diagnostics

In laboratory plasmas, the appeal of Inglis–Teller is its immediacy. You can often "see" density change in real time as the high-n tail of hydrogen emission compresses and disappears. Gas discharges and arc plasmas are classic settings: hydrogen lines are bright, line series are accessible in common spectral bands, and microfields can be strong enough that dissolution becomes obvious without elaborate modeling.

In higher-energy laboratory contexts—laser-produced plasmas, pulsed-power devices, and fusion experiments—the method often appears as a quick density estimator or a sanity check rather than the final word. The edge and divertor regions of fusion devices, for example, can produce rich hydrogenic emission (or hydrogen-like emission from impurities), and Stark broadening methods are used to infer local electron density. Inglis–Teller sits in that family as a threshold-based diagnostic: if detailed line-shape fitting is hard (because profiles are distorted, time-varying, or blended), the series termination can still provide an effective density scale that constrains models and complements other measurements.

11.3 Rydberg physics as a bridge between AMO and plasma spectroscopy

Inglis–Teller is also a conceptual bridge between atomic, molecular, and optical physics and plasma spectroscopy because it is fundamentally a Rydberg phenomenon. Rydberg states are where atomic structure becomes exquisitely sensitive to weak perturbations, where degeneracy and mixing dominate, and where "environmental" fields become spectroscopically visible. The plasma microfield is essentially an uncontrolled Stark experiment performed by nature at microscopic scales.

This bridge works both ways. AMO intuition helps plasma spectroscopists understand why high-n structure collapses, why the scaling is steep, and why statistical field distributions matter. Meanwhile, plasma reality reminds AMO practitioners that the clean multiplets of controlled-field experiments are a special case: once you embed a sensitive quantum system in a stochastic field bath, the natural object of study becomes an ensemble-averaged line shape (or a dissolution threshold) rather than discrete component positions.

11.4 Why simple scaling laws persist in messy environments

It can feel surprising that a compact relation like Inglis–Teller remains useful in environments that are inhomogeneous, time-varying, and full of competing broadening mechanisms. The reason is that the method targets a **threshold phenomenon** governed by strong, monotonic trends. Hydrogenic level spacing shrinks rapidly with n, Stark sensitivity grows rapidly with n, and typical microfield scales grow with density. When three steep trends collide, they create a robust crossover even when the details are messy.

Another reason is that the exponent is structurally "hard to escape." Even if the constant shifts because of screening, charge state mixtures, electron impacts, or observational definitions of resolvability, the basic n-dependence tends to remain steep. That makes Inglis–Teller valuable as a first-pass diagnostic and as a constraint: it tells you what order of magnitude density must be for the spectrum to terminate where it does. In messy environments, that kind of constraint is often exactly what you need—something stable enough to guide interpretation without pretending to be the whole truth.

12. Conclusion: The Same Stark Effect, Reversed Logic

The Stark effect is one of the cleanest demonstrations in quantum physics that "environment matters": a field modifies a system not by adding noise, but by changing the Hamiltonian and therefore the eigenstates themselves. In molecular spectroscopy, we celebrate this by building the environment—uniform fields, calibrated electrodes, controlled geometries—so the Stark effect becomes a precise tool for reading molecular structure. In plasmas, the environment is not built; it is lived in. The field is not a knob but a fluctuating microfield generated by a moving, charged population. And that shift in posture flips the inference. You do not use a known field to measure the emitter; you use the emitter's field sensitivity—especially in high-n hydrogenic states—to measure the plasma. The Inglis–Teller relation is the compact expression of that inversion: the same Stark physics, but with the direction of measurement reversed.

12.1 The conceptual takeaway: from applied-field metrology to density inference

The deepest takeaway is conceptual, not algebraic. In the laboratory Stark experiment, the field is the independent variable. You set E, you observe splitting and shifts, and you infer dipole moments, polarizabilities, and mixing parameters. In the plasma Stark environment, E is not a single value but a distribution. You observe a profile, a wing, a termination point—an ensemble signature—and you infer the microfield statistics, which in turn encode density (and sometimes charge state and screening).

Seen this way, Inglis–Teller is not a special plasma trick. It is the natural diagnostic you would invent if you asked: "What happens to the most field-sensitive quantum states when the field is

random and density-controlled?" High-n hydrogenic levels provide the answer because they sit at the convergence of two steep trends: adjacent-level spacing collapses rapidly with n, while Stark sensitivity grows rapidly with n. A stochastic microfield environment forces those trends to collide. The spectrum then carries a visible, qualitative marker of that collision—the last resolvable line—and the steepness of the underlying scalings makes that marker an unusually sensitive density indicator.

12.2 What the Inglis–Teller relation gives you—and what it cannot

Used appropriately, Inglis–Teller gives you something rare: a density estimate derived from an easily recognized spectral threshold without requiring a full line-shape fit. It excels when the high-n termination is physically driven (microfields truly dissolve the ladder) and when hydrogenic assumptions are justified. In that role it provides:

- A rapid, order-of-magnitude **density scale** (often interpretable as electron density under quasi-neutral, low-Z conditions).
- A strong **comparative diagnostic**: changes in n_max map to large relative changes in density, useful for tracking trends across conditions.
- A robust **constraint** in messy spectra: even when detailed profile modeling is hard, the termination point limits what densities are plausible.

But it also has clear limits, and naming them is part of using it honestly:

- It cannot by itself disentangle ion microfield broadening from **electron-impact broadening** when both contribute significantly.
- It cannot guarantee hydrogenic scaling for **non-hydrogenic emitters** or in plasmas with strong quantum defects, mixtures, or high charge states without appropriate corrections.
- It cannot protect you from observational artifacts: **instrument resolution**, blending, continuum placement, and radiative transfer can all create apparent "merging" unrelated to Stark dissolution.
- It does not yield a uniquely defined "plasma density" in strongly **inhomogeneous or time-varying** plasmas; instead it returns an effective density scale weighted by where emission and dissolution are most influential.

In other words, Inglis–Teller is best treated as a steep, physically motivated heuristic that can be remarkably accurate in its natural regime—but that becomes model-dependent and easily biased outside that regime.

12.3 A disciplined workflow for using “line merging” as a diagnostic

A disciplined use of Inglis–Teller is simple, but it is not casual. The workflow is:

1. **Choose the cleanest observable hydrogenic series** for your bandpass and plasma (Balmer, Paschen, etc.), and anchor your line identification with a run of unambiguous consecutive members.
2. **Define “resolvable” operationally** (local minima above noise, stable two-line fits, or a consistent linewidth-to-spacing criterion) and apply that criterion consistently.
3. **Identify n_max** as the last member that truly meets that criterion, and compute densities for n_max and plausible alternatives (n_max±1) to expose sensitivity.
4. **State the model assumptions explicitly** (ions-only vs mixed, quasi-neutrality, charge state expectations, hydrogenic applicability). If you are reporting Ne, say why Ne ≈ Ni (or how Z_eff enters).
5. **Audit confounders**: compare physical linewidths to instrumental resolution; check for blends; consider optical depth; note temperature changes and time variability; ask whether the emission region is representative of the plasma region you care about.
6. **Triangulate when possible** with another diagnostic or with profile-based Stark broadening fits in a region where line shapes are measurable.

If you follow that workflow, “line merging” becomes more than an aesthetic observation near a series limit. It becomes a controlled inference: the same Stark effect you already know from molecular spectroscopy, translated into a statistical language appropriate to plasmas, and used with enough rigor that its steep power-law sensitivity becomes an advantage rather than a trap.

Expand: 13. References (Compiled later: Stark effect foundations, hydrogenic Stark structure, microfield distributions, Stark broadening theory, Inglis–Teller original work and later refinements, plasma spectroscopy diagnostics, astrophysical applications.)

Thought for 4m 33s

13. References

13.1 Original Stark effect and early quantum treatments

- Stark, J. (1914). Beobachtungen über den Effekt des elektrischen Feldes auf Spektrallinien. I. Quereffekt. Annalen der Physik, 348(7), 965–982. doi:10.1002/andp.19143480702.
- Epstein, P. S. (1916). Zur Theorie des Starkeffektes. Annalen der Physik, 355(13), 489–520. doi:10.1002/andp.19163551302.

- Schrödinger, E. (1926). Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem. 3. Mitteilung: Störungstheorie mit Anwendung auf den Stark-Effekt der Balmerlinien. Annalen der Physik, 80, 437–490.

13.2 Hydrogenic structure, Rydberg sensitivity, and "high-n compression"

- Bethe, H. A., & Salpeter, E. E. (1957). *Quantum Mechanics of One- and Two-Electron Atoms*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-12869-5.
- Gallagher, T. F. (1994). *Rydberg Atoms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmerman, M. L., Littman, M. G., Kash, M. M., & Kleppner, D. (1979). Stark structure of the Rydberg states of alkali-metal atoms. *Physical Review A*, 20, 2251. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.20.2251.

13.3 Microfields in plasmas and field distributions

- Holtsmark, J. (1919). Über die Verbreiterung von Spektrallinien. *Annalen der Physik*, 363(18), 577–630. doi:10.1002/andp.19193631802.
- Hooper, C. F. (1966). Low-frequency electric microfield distributions in plasmas. *Physical Review*, 149, 77. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.149.77.
- Iglesias, C. A., Lebowitz, J. L., & MacGowan, D. (1983). Electric microfield distributions in strongly coupled plasmas. *Physical Review A*, 28(3), 1667–1672. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.28.1667.
- Iglesias, C. A., Lebowitz, J. L., MacGowan, D., & DeWitt, H. E. (1985). Low-frequency electric microfield distributions in plasmas. *Physical Review A*, 31, 1698. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.31.1698.
- Nayfonov, A., Däppen, W., Hummer, D. G., & Mihalas, D. (1999). The MHD equation of state with post-Holtsmark microfield distributions. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 526(1). doi:10.1086/307972.

13.4 Stark broadening theory and line-shape models

- Baranger, M. (1958). General impact theory of pressure broadening. *Physical Review*, 111, 481–493.
- Griem, H. R. (1974). *Spectral Line Broadening by Plasmas*. Academic Press.
- Griem, H. R. (1997). *Principles of Plasma Spectroscopy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kepple, P., & Griem, H. R. (1968). Improved Stark profile calculations for the hydrogen lines. *Physical Review*, 173, 317–325. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.173.317.

- Vidal, C. R., Cooper, J., & Smith, E. W. (1973). Unified theory of hydrogen line broadening and related tables. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 25, 37–136. doi:10.1086/190264.
- Stehlé, C., & Hutcheon, R. (1999). Extensive tabulations of Stark-broadened hydrogen line profiles. *Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement Series*, 140, 93–97.

13.5 Inglis–Teller, line merging, dissolution, and continuum lowering

- Inglis, D. R., & Teller, E. (1939). Ionic depression of series limits in one-electron spectra. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 90, 439–448. doi:10.1086/144118.
- Hummer, D. G., & Mihalas, D. (1988). The equation of state for stellar envelopes. I. An occupation probability formalism for the truncation of internal partition functions. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 331, 794–814. doi:10.1086/166600.
- Mihalas, D., Däppen, W., & Hummer, D. G. (1988). The equation of state for stellar envelopes. II. Algorithm and selected results. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 331, 815–825. doi:10.1086/166601.
- Stewart, J. C., & Pyatt, K. D. (1966). Lowering of ionization potentials in plasmas. *Physical Review*, 144, 1203–1211. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.144.1203.
- Ecker, G., & Kröll, W. (1963). Lowering of the ionization energy in a plasma. *Physics of Fluids*, 6, 62–69.

13.6 Diagnostics practice and applications (lab + astrophysical)

- Konjević, N. (1999). Plasma broadening and shifting of non-hydrogenic spectral lines: present status and applications. *Physics Reports*, 316, 339–401. doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(98)00132-X.
- Tremblay, P.-E., & Bergeron, P. (2009). Spectroscopic analysis of DA white dwarfs with improved Stark profiles. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 696, 1755–1770. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/696/2/1755.

13.7 Molecular Stark spectroscopy (controlled fields, polar molecules, polarizability)

- Townes, C. H., & Schawlow, A. L. (1955). *Microwave Spectroscopy*. McGraw-Hill.
- Herzberg, G. (1945). *Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure I. Diatomic Molecules*. Van Nostrand.
- Brown, J. M., & Carrington, A. (2003). *Rotational Spectroscopy of Diatomic Molecules*. Cambridge University Press.

- Friedrich, B., & Herschbach, D. (1995). Alignment and orientation of molecules in strong electric fields. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 99, 15686–15693. doi:10.1021/j100042a022.

13.8 Data resources and line databases

- Dimitrijević, M. S., & Sahal-Bréchot, S. (1998). STARK-B: A database of Stark broadening parameters. *Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement Series*, 127, 543–548.
- Sahal-Bréchot, S. (1969). Impact theory of Stark broadening (foundational series on electron/ion broadening of isolated lines). *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 1, 91–123.

The author has published over 4,800 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.